

REMARKS

The Applicant's attorney thanks the Examiner for the courtesy extended during the telephonic interview of 25 May 2004. Through the interview, it was confirmed that references to '820 in the rejection should have been to U.S. Patent No. 6,238,840 to Huey. Furthermore, certain other aspects of the rejection were further explained, the substance of which is included below. Claims 13-20 have been cancelled without prejudice to reconsideration in a continuing application, and claims 1 and 9 have been amended. Reconsideration of the present application as amended is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-10, 13, and 15-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,238,840 to Huey (Huey). In the Final Office Action, it was stated that the Huey reference discloses "several implementations of the invention (see the Summary), including providing slurry and cleaning fluid while the wafer is present, cleaning the pad when the wafer is not present, and preparing the pad prior to polishing." During the telephonic interview, it was further explained that column 5, lines 48-52 of Huey were specifically relied upon for support that the wafer was present during the cleaning process. After careful review and consideration of the entire content of the Huey reference, including the passage indicated during the interview, it is respectfully submitted that the Huey reference fails to expressly or inherently disclose, teach, or suggest such features.

However, to further point out the features of the claims, both independent claims 1 and 9 have been amended to clarify that the spraying of the high pressure fluid occurs while the wafer substrate is on the pad (emphasis added). Such features are in addition to earlier cited distinctions. For example, the features of independent claim 1 include spraying the high

Request for Reconsideration After Final Office Action
Inventor: Vines et al.
Application No.: 09/871,507
Filed: May 31, 2001
Page 6 of 9

spraying step. In contrast, retainer 78 of the Huey device is lowered to contact polishing pad 54 such that it forms a dam to retain slurry and rinse water with a reservoir formed by the retainer and pad. (Huey, col. 4, lines 41-43). Rotating pad 54 while retainer 78 is lowered would seem to jeopardize proper operation. Indeed there is no such teaching in the Huey reference along these lines. In another example, claim 5 recites a speed range for the rotation of the pad in claim 4 which is also not disclosed, taught, or suggested. Accordingly, several reasons support rejected dependent claims corresponding to claim 1.

Independent claim 9 has also been amended to more particularly clarify the intended features of spraying the high pressure fluid while the wafer substrate is on the pad. Claim 9 also includes other distinct features not disclosed, taught, or suggested by the Huey reference. For example, claim 9 includes spraying a high pressure fluid around a wafer substrate to remove slurry from between the substrate and the pad (emphasis added). Moreover, claim 9 additionally includes rotating the pad at a second speed during the spraying step that is different from the first speed. As previously explained, rotation of Huey's pad 54 at any speed during spraying is not disclosed -- let alone the different speed features recited in claim 9. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claim 9 is also not anticipated.

Besides the patentability of claim 9, further reasons support the patentability of various rejected dependent claims corresponding to claim 9. For example, claims 11 and 12 recite different speed ranges for the second speed that are not disclosed, taught, or suggested by the Huey reference.

Claims 13-20 have been cancelled without prejudice to consideration in a continuing application and therefore render this aspect to the rejection moot.

Request for Reconsideration After Final Office Action
Inventor: Vines et al.
Application No.: 09/871,507
Filed: May 31, 2001
Page 8 of 9

In view of the foregoing it is believed that claims 1-12 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the present application as amended is respectfully requested. The Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any outstanding matters concerning the present application.

Respectfully submitted:



L. Scott Paynter
Reg. No. 39,797
Woodard, Emhardt, Moriarty, McNett & Henry
Bank One Center Tower
111 Monument Circle, Suite 3700
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-5137
(317) 634-3456

Request for Reconsideration After Final Office Action
Inventor: Vines et al.
Application No.: 09/871,507
Filed: May 31, 2003
Page 9 of 9